

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-57216-2023

Date of decision: 28.02.2024

Parveen Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Abhishek Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasleen Chahal, AAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.265 dated 13.07.2023 under Sections 419 and 420 of the IPC (Sections 500, 501, 509, 201, 468, 469 and 120-B of the IPC and Sections 66 and 66(A) of the Information and Technology Act, 2000 added lateron) registered at Police Station City Thanesar, Kurukshetra.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 26.07.2023 in a case of false implication. It has also been submitted that 06 prosecution witnesses out of the 31 cited including the complainant already stand examined, hence, further incarceration of the petitioner in the case in hand would serve no useful purpose.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, has drawn the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the FIR, which

has been annexed as Annexure P-1. While reiterating the allegations levelled in the FIR, it has been submitted that the petitioner was working as a Peon in the District Courts at Kurukshetra. He had an axe to grind against the judicial officers posted there as he had been misbehaving with them as a result of which a penalty of stoppage of one annual grade increment with cumulative effect had also been imposed upon him. It has been further submitted that it was in the aforementioned background, the petitioner, just to bring disrepute to the judicial officers, fabricated letters in the name of the complainant, who was working as a Daftri in the Court, as well as in the name of many other Court officials and started circulating them. Resultantly, the image of not only the judicial officers but even the judiciary had been severely tarnished by him. It has been submitted that it was a matter of record that besides a penalty of stoppage of annual grade increment, many adverse reports had been made against the petitioner by different judicial officers. Learned State counsel on instructions has also submitted that the case of the petitioner is not at par with that of co-accused Surender Kumar, who has since been extended the concession of bail. She submits that the co-accused, who had been extended the concession of bail did not have any criminal antecedents whereas it is a matter of record that the present petitioner is involved in one other criminal case i.e. FIR No.324/2021 under Sections 354-A, 341, 180 of the IPC registered at Police Station City Thanesar, Kurukshetra, which is pending trial.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. Prima facie, there are serious allegations levelled against the petitioner in the FIR in question for which he does not deserve the concession of regular bail at this stage.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

7. It is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. The learned Trial Court is, however, directed to expedite the trial and conclude it at the earliest.

28.02.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No